

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheet(s) of drawing(s) includes changes to Figures 1A, 1B, and 1C. In particular, Figures 1A, 1B, and 1C have been amended to indicate that they are prior art.

Attachments:           Replacement Sheet 1 with Figures 1A, 1B, and 1C.

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-37 are pending in the above identified application. Claims 1-6 have been withdrawn from consideration and canceled in this application. The Examiner has rejected claims 7-9 and 15. The Examiner has objected to claims 10-14 and 16-27. The specification has been amended to correct some grammatical errors. The figures have been amended to provide the legend --Prior Art-- to Figures 1A, 1B, and 1C. Claims 1-6 have been canceled. Claims 7, 25-27, and 29 have been amended for clarity. New claims 38-45 have been added. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

### **Elections/Restrictions**

The Examiner has restricted the claims to Group I claims 1-6, “drawn to a transmission system comprising a plurality of transmitters, classified in class 375, subclass 295” and Group II claims 7-37 “drawn to a transmission system comprising a plurality of receivers, classified in class 375, subclass 316.” In the interest of furthering prosecution on this application, and without agreeing with the Examiner regarding the need of a restriction in this application, Applicants confirm the election made on December 9, 2004, to Group II claims.

Subsequently, claims 1-6 are withdrawn from consideration in this application. Further, Applicants have canceled claims 1-6 from this application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims 1-6 in a subsequently filed application.

### **Drawings**

The Examiner has indicated that the drawings filed with the application are acceptable for examination purposes but that formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed. Applicants will file the formal drawings at, or before, allowance of the application.

The Examiner has further indicated that Figures 1A-C should be designated by legend as --Prior Art--. Accordingly, Figures 1A, 1B, and 1C have been amended to provide the legend --Prior Art--.

### **Specification**

The Examiner has suggested that Applicants define the acronym SERDES in paragraph [005] of page 2 of the specification. The acronym SERDES is defined in the last sentence of paragraph [004] on pages 1-2. Paragraph [004] states: “Typically, the transceiver for sending high-speed data over a backplane **is called a serializer/deserializer, or SERDES,** device.” (emphasis added).

Applicants have further amended the specification to correct some minor grammatical errors. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 “under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rowan et al. (WO 99/45683).” However, Rowan does not teach all of the elements of claim 7. For example, Rowan does not teach “an equalizer coupled to receive the digitized signals” as is recited in claim 7.

Rowan teaches “transmission of digital data over optical fibers, and more particularly, to transmission based on quadrature amplitude modulation (QAM) and frequency division multiplexing.” (Rowan, page 1, lines 11-13). The Examiner has identified element 1002 of Rowan as an equalizer. However, element 1002 is simply a QAM demodulator and is not an equalizer. An equalizer counters intersymbol interference that can be caused by dispersion in the

transmission medium and reflections from other vias, which has the effect of mixing the transmitted symbols to form the signal received at the receiver. An equalizer recovers sequentially transmitted symbols from the input signal, where the transmitted symbols have been mixed due to distortions in the transmission medium.

As taught in Rowan, “QAM demodulator 1002 removes the QAM modulation from the incoming QAM-modulated signal 712.” (Rowan, page 15, lines 10-11). Further, Rowan teaches that “QAM demodulator 1002 demodulates the incoming QAM-modulated signal 712A, typically extracting baseband I and Q signals from the modulated carrier.” (Rowan, page 16, lines 21-22). The QAM demodulator, then, simply recovers the originally sent data from each individual symbol.

Further, it is not obvious to include an equalizer into the teachings of Rowan. Because Rowan teaches transmission of data over an optical system, dispersion effects such as intersymbol interference that can become problematic in other transmission media are not observed. Consequently, the need for equalization in a transmission system as taught by Rowan does not exist.

Therefore, claim 7 is allowable over Rowan.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 9, and 15 “under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowan et al. (WO99/45683) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Baker et al. US Patent 6,163,563).”

Claims 8, 9, and 15 depend from claim 7 and are allowable over Rowan for at least the same reason as is claim 7. Baker does not cure the defects in the teachings of Rowan. As

discussed above, Rowan does not teach an “equalizer” as is recited in claim 7. Baker teaches spread-spectrum transmission of data utilizing wireless communications. Baker does not teach an equalizer as is recited in claim 7. Further, for similar reasons as is discussed above, utilization of an equalizer in the transmission system of Baker is not obvious.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner indicates that claims 10-14 and 16-37 are allowable “if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.” However, these claims depend from claims 7-9 and 15, which are allowable over the cited prior art as discussed above. Therefore, no amendments have been made to claims 10-14 and 16-37 at this time.

### **New Claims**

Claims 38-45 have been added in this Amendment. Support for new claims 38-45 can be found throughout the application, for example in Figure 5 and the discussion related to Figure 5. Claims 38-45 are allowable over the prior art for the same reasons as is claims 7-37.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 17, 2005

By: 

Gary J. Edwards  
Reg. No. 41,008.

**Attachments:** Replacement sheet 1, Figures 1A, 1B, and 1C.

<b>Express Mail Label No.</b> <b>EV 606105955 US</b>
---------------------------------------------------------